

## **REMARKS**

In the Office action mailed August 3, 2005, the examiner allows claims 7 and 16, objects to claims 22 and 23, rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-15, 17-21, 24, and 25, and objects to the drawings. This reply amends claims 1, 8-10, 17, 24, and 25 and cancels claims 22 and 23. As such, claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-21, 24, and 25 are pending and under consideration.

### **I. Response to § 102 rejections**

The examiner rejects claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-21, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,421,667 ("Codd"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

On page 2, lines 3-8, of the Office action, the examiner describes a feature and indicates that the prior art does not teach this feature. At least because claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 24, and 25 now include a feature similar to the feature described by the examiner, Codd does not anticipate these claims. Claims 2, 4-7, 11, 13-15, and 18-21 are not anticipated by Codd at least because they depend upon an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, claim 1 describes a single flow control unit that selects a first action based on a first event object and also selects a second action based on a second event object, where the second event objected is received as a result of executing the first action. Codd also does not anticipate claim 1 because Codd does not teach or suggest this feature. The other independent claims also are not anticipated by Codd at least because they each comprise a feature similar to this feature of claim 1.

### **II. Response to drawing objection**

The examiner objects to the drawings and asserts that they do not show every feature of claims 7, 16, 22, and 23. However, the Office action does not explain which feature of these claims is not shown in the drawings. During a telephone conference held on October 5, 2005, the examiner seemed to explain that the drawings do not shown any of the features of claims 7, 16, 22, and 23. In response to this explanation, the applicants point out part 15 of figure 1, showing an action/attribute storage unit, as an example of a claim feature shown in the drawing. If the examiner continues to object to these claims, the applicants respectfully request the examiner to indicate which feature the examiner feels needs to be added to the drawings.

### III. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this reply, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 01/03/2006

By: Skylar Gain

E. F. C. Gain Jr.  
Registration No. 55,917

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501